



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,294	11/20/2003	Daniel Otto Becker	AUS920030849US1	1214
35525	7590	06/09/2006	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			BANGACHON, WILLIAM L	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC				
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75380			PAPER NUMBER	
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Period for Reply

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/20/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2612

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,239,718 (hereinafter 'Hoyt et al') in view of USP 6,538,556 (hereinafter 'Kawajiri').

In claim 9, a data processing system in a signaling device 7 for delivering codes to control multimedia devices, the data processing system comprising:

identifying means (5), responsive to receiving a signal from a remote control device (3), for identifying a sequence of commands corresponding to the signal, wherein the sequence of commands, maintained in the signaling device, contains a set of codes used to control a set of multimedia devices (11, 15, 17, 13) {col. 5, lines 38-65; col. 6, lines 26+}; and

transmitting means (7) for transmitting the set of codes to the set of multimedia devices, wherein the set of codes causes a series of events to occur in the set of multimedia devices (11, 15, 17, 13) {col. 5, lines 56-65; col. 7, lines 19-25}.

Hoyt et al do not disclose **“a macro containing a set of codes having a first portion for causing a first event to occur in a first device and a second portion for causing a second event to occur in a second device of the set of multimedia devices such that multiple events occur in response to the signal received from the remote control device”**. Kawajiri, in the same field of endeavor (data processing systems), teach of such features, as shown in figure 5 and described in column 1, lines 7-19+ and column 7, lines 39-53+. Kawajiri suggests that these features are advantageous **“for controlling one or more apparatuses to reliably bring all apparatuses into their desired states when a user makes the apparatuses continuously execute a plurality of functions by a single operation of the remote controller”** {Kawajiri, paragraph bridging cols. 1 and 2}. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of applicant's invention, to include such features in the system of Hoyt et al, as taught by Kawajiri, because it will **reliably bring all controlled apparatuses into their desired states when a user makes the apparatuses continuously execute a plurality of functions by a single operation of the remote controller”**.

In claims 10 and 18, the set of multimedia devices includes at least a television (17) or digital versatile disc player (13) {Hoyt et al, col. 6, lines 1-20}.

In claims 11 and 19, although Hoyt et al do not disclose “sequentially turns on the television (17), turns on the stereo receiver, waits for two seconds, and sets an input mode in the stereo receiver”, these series of events would have been just a matter of design choice in the system of Hoyt et al because these events can be easily programmed into the system of Hoyt et al {Hoyt et al, col. 6, lines 14-20}.

In claim 12, the transmitting comprises means transmitting a series of infra-red signals to transmit the set of codes {col. 5, lines 29-36; col. 6, lines 1-8}.

In claim 13, the transmitting means comprises means for transmitting a set of radio frequency signals {Hoyt et al, col. 5, lines 19-28}.

In claim 14, the data processing further comprising:

entering means (21), responsive to an upload signal, entering an upload mode {Hoyt et al, col. 5, lines 38-50};

receiving means (23) for receiving a second macro while in the upload mode {Hoyt et al, col. 6, lines 42-47}; and

storing means (27) for storing the second macro, wherein the second macro includes a second set of codes {Hoyt et al, col. 6, lines 57-64}.

In claim 15, the upload signal is received from one of a computer or the remote control device (3).

In claim 16, the signaling device a relay unit since it is used to relay the sequence of commands transmitted from the remote control unit (3).

Claims 1-8 recites a method for practicing the system of claims 9-16 and therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 17 recites the combination of claims 9 and 14 and therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 20 recites the combination of claims 9, 14 and 16, and therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Office Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to William Bangachon whose telephone number is **(571)-272-3065**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday, 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on **(571)-272-7308**. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300** for regular and After Final formal communications. The Examiner's fax number is **(571)-273-3065** for informal communications.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2612

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

William L Bangachon
Examiner
Art Unit 2635

June 5, 2006


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600